

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

DEC 12 2006

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

- A) Claims 2—5, 16, 22—25 and 28 remain in their original form.
- B) Claims 11, 15, 18, 21, 29 and 35 are previously presented.
- C) Claims 1, 8—10, 12—14, 26 and 29—33 are currently amended.
- D) Claims 6, 7, 17, 19, 20, 27 and 34 are cancelled.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Traversal of the §103 Rejections

Claims 1—16, 18—26, 28—33 and 35 were rejected under §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,711,677, hereinafter "Wiegley" in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,362,879, hereinafter "Berg." In response, the Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 recites a printer device comprising:

- a data input device for receiving an encrypted digital document file;
- a decryption algorithm for decrypting said received document file;
- a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in said received document file, wherein said controller operates to read quantity permission data from said document file, said quantity permission data specifying a number of copies of said document file authorized to be printed, and wherein said controller operates to generate a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file; and
- a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document file;
- wherein said controller operates to control printing of the number of copies authorized to be printed, and after printing the number of copies authorized to be printed of the document file, automatically deletes said document file from said memory.

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

1 Claim 1 has been amended to recite limitations earlier seen in Claim 8.
2 Accordingly, Claim 1 recites controller operation "to generate a confirmation
3 message confirming receipt of said document file". Such a confirmation is not
4 taught or suggested by the Wiegley and/or Berg references.

5 In addressing Claim 8 (now incorporated into Claim 1), the Patent Office
6 suggested that Wiegley teaches such a confirmation message at column 1, lines
7 12—26 and column 4, lines 30—46. The Applicant respectfully disagrees with
8 this characterization of these passages in Wiegley.

9 In fact, at column 1, Wiegley teaches a "handshaking" exercise wherein
10 information is passed back and forth, thereby confirming the identity of both
11 parties (using public key/private key) and establishing the session key for the
12 transaction. There is no mention of a confirmation message confirming receipt of
13 an encrypted digital document file, which is later printed, as recited by the claim.

14 Referring next to column 4, lines 30—46, Wiegley discloses additional
15 steps wherein an authenticity certificate is obtained to help prevent "printer
16 impersonations." In a printer impersonation, a bad actor pretends to be a printer,
17 hoping to be sent an important and secret document by an unsuspecting user.

18 Therefore, a review of columns 1 and 4 of Wiegley does not teach use of a
19 confirmation message indicating receipt of a document file that is then printed. In
20 contrast, Wiegley discloses party authentication and session key establishment.

21 The Patent Office appears to equate the various messages involved in (1)
22 the authentication of the parties, and (2) the establishment of the session key with
23 a confirmation message confirming the receipt the document file, which is then
24 printed. The Applicant respectfully submits that these messages are distinct from
25

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

1 the recited confirmation message. Accordingly, the Wiegley reference does not
2 teach or suggest generation of a confirmation message confirming receipt of said
3 document file, as recited by Claim 1.

4 Therefore, at least this element recited in the Applicant's Claim 1, as
5 amended, is not taught by any reference of the prior art of record. Accordingly,
6 the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 1, as
7 amended, be removed.

8 **Claims 2—5 and 8** depend from Claim 1 and are allowable due to their
9 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
10 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 1, are
11 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
12 combination with one another.

13 **Claim 9** recites a printer device comprising:

- 14 • a data input device for receiving an encrypted digital document file;
- 15 • a decryption algorithm for decrypting said received document file;
- 16 • a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in
17 said received document file, wherein said controller operates to read
18 a quantity permission data content from said document file, said
19 quantity permission data specifying a number of authorized copies of
20 said document file to be printed, and wherein said controller
21 operates to generate a confirmation message confirming receipt
22 of said document file; and
- 23 • a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document
24 file, wherein said controller operates to check a unique device
25 identification data contained in said document file with a stored
unique device identification data of said printer device, and provided
a successful match is found, to print said physical copy of said
document file and to delete said document file after printing said
physical copy; and
- if said received unique device identifier differs from said stored
unique device identifier data, said controller operates to delete said
document file without printing a physical copy of said document file.

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

1 Claim 9 has been amended to reflect material previously seen in Claim 8,
2 and currently seen in Claim 1. Therefore, the remarks seen above with respect to
3 Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Applicant submits
4 that Claim 9 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

5 In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited
6 in Claim 9, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.
7 Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of
8 Claim 9, as amended, be removed.

9 Claim 10 recites a computer system configured for sending secure
10 encrypted document files, said system comprising:

- 11 • a data processor;
- 12 • a memory;
- 13 • an encryption algorithm capable of encrypting a document file;
- 14 • a device selector for selecting a said uniquely identifiable recipient
15 device;
- 16 • a file selector for selecting a document file;
- 17 • a stored list of a set of authorized recipient devices, each said
18 recipient device identified by a unique device identifier data
19 inaccessibly embedded within said computer system;
- 20 • wherein said computer system operates to:
 - 21 • select at least one document file, wherein the selected document
22 file comprises quantity permission data specifying a number of
23 copies of said document file authorized to be printed;
 - 24 • select at least one said uniquely identifiable recipient device to
25 send said document to:
 - encrypt said document files; and
 - address said at least one document file to said selected uniquely
identified recipient device; and
- at least one recipient printer device, said recipient printer device
capable of receiving an encrypted document file, establishing that
said encrypted document file is intended for said recipient printer
device, **generate a confirmation message confirming receipt of
said document file**, decrypting and printing said encrypted
document file, and automatically deleting said document file after
printing a physical copy of a document from said document file.

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

1 Claim 10 has been amended to reflect material previously seen in Claim 8,
2 and currently seen in Claims 1 and 9. Therefore, the remarks seen above with
3 respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the
4 Applicant submits that Claim 10 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is
5 allowable.

6 In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited
7 in Claim 10, as amended, are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record.
8 Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of
9 Claim 10, as amended, be removed.

10 Claims 11—14 depend from Claim 10 and are allowable due to their
11 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
12 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 10, are
13 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
14 combination with one another.

15 Claim 15 recites a distributed secure document printing system, said
16 system comprising:

- 17 • at least one sending computer entity, capable of sending an
18 encrypted electronic document file, said document file having an
19 encrypted data content, and a unique device identifier data
20 identifying a recipient printer device to which said document file is
21 intended to be printed by; and
- 22 • at least one recipient printer device, said recipient printer device
23 capable of receiving said encrypted document file, establishing that
24 said document file is intended for said recipient printer device,
25 decrypting and printing said document file, and automatically
deleting said electronic document file after printing a physical copy
of a document from said document file;
- wherein said recipient printer device is configured to send a
confirmation message back to said sending computer entity,
confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file, wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within the document file.

Independent Claim 15 is not currently amended.

Claim 15 recites sending "a confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file".

Accordingly, Claim 15 recites material similar to that originally seen in Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9 and 10. Therefore, the remarks seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 15 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

Additionally, the Applicant notes that the last paragraph of Claim 15 does not appear to be have been addressed in the rejection of Claim 15. Accordingly, the Applicant anticipates the same (or similar) rejection as applied to Claim 8, and incorporates by reference the remarks associated with Claim 1.

In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited in Claim 15 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 15, as amended, be removed.

Claim 16 depends from Claim 15 and is allowable due to its dependence from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 15, are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

1 **Claim 18** recites a method of securely communicating an electronic
2 document file over a network, said method comprising the steps of:

- 3 • encrypting said document file;
- 4 • specifying a recipient device for sending said document file to, said
5 recipient device being uniquely identifiable by a unique device
6 identifier data;
- 7 • attaching said unique identifier data to said document file;
- 8 • sending said document file in encrypted format to said intended
9 recipient device;
- 10 • receiving said transmitted document file and decrypting said
11 document file;
- 12 • reading said unique device identifier data of said document file.
- 13 • if said unique device identifier data of said document file
14 corresponds to a unique device identifier data of said recipient
15 device, printing a physical copy of said document file and
16 automatically deleting said document file;
- 17 • if said unique device identifier data of said document file does not
18 correspond with said unique device identifier data of said recipient
19 device, deleting said received document file without printing a
20 physical copy of said document file; and
- 21 • **sending, from said recipient device, a confirmation message back**
22 **to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said**
23 **document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted**
24 **number of copies of said document file, wherein the specified**
25 **permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within**
the document file.

17 Independent Claim 18 is not currently amended.

18 Claim 18 recites sending "sending, from said recipient device, a
19 confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of
20 said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of
21 copies of said document file".

22 Accordingly, Claim 18 recites material similar to that originally seen in
23 Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9, 10 and 15. Therefore, the remarks
24 seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference.
25

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

1 Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 18 is allowable for at least the
2 reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

3 Additionally, the Applicant notes that the last paragraph of Claim 18 does
4 not appear to have been addressed in the rejection of Claim 18. Accordingly,
5 the Applicant anticipates the same (or similar) rejection as applied to Claim 8, and
6 incorporates by reference the remarks associated with Claim 1.

7 In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited
8 in Claim 18 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly,
9 the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 18 be
10 removed.

11 **Claim 21** recites a method of secure printing of a received document file,
12 said method comprising the steps of:

- 13 • receiving said document file in encrypted format at a receiving device;
- 14 • decrypting said document file;
- 15 • reading a unique device identifier data identifying a recipient device for which said document file is intended;
- 16 • comparing said unique device identifier data with a locally stored device identifier data stored at said receiving device;
- 17 • if said received unique device identifier data corresponds with said locally stored device identifier data, printing at least one physical copy of said document file and automatically deleting said document file;
- 18 • if said received unique device identifier data differs from said stored unique device identifier data, deleting said document file; and
- 19 • **sending, from said recipient device, a confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file, wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within the document file.**

20
21
22
23
24 Independent Claim 21 is not currently amended.
25

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

1 Claim 21 recites sending "sending, from said recipient device, a
2 confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of
3 said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of
4 copies of said document file".

5 Accordingly, Claim 21 recites material similar to that originally seen in
6 Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9, 10, 15 and 18. Therefore, the remarks
7 seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference.
8 Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 21 is allowable for at least the
9 reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

10 Additionally, the Applicant notes that the last paragraph of Claim 21 does
11 not appear to be have been addressed in the rejection of Claim 21. Accordingly,
12 the Applicant anticipates the same (or similar) rejection as applied to Claim 8, and
13 incorporates by reference the remarks associated with Claim 1.

14 In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited
15 in Claim 21 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly,
16 the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 21 be
17 removed.

18 Claims 22—25 depend from Claim 21 and are allowable due to their
19 dependence from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for
20 their own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 21, are
21 neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in
22 combination with one another.

23 Claim 26 recites a method of sending a document file for printing by a
24 specified authorized recipient printing device, said method comprising the steps
25 of:

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

- selecting a content of said document file;
- encrypting said content;
- attaching a unique device identifier data, identifying a recipient device to which said document file is to be sent;
- sending said document file to said recipient device;
- adding a permitted quantity data to said document file, said permitted quantity data specifying a permitted number of copies of said document file which can be printed; and
- **receiving a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file.**

Claim 26 recites sending "receiving a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file".

Accordingly, Claim 26 recites material similar to that originally seen in Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9, 10, 15, 18 and 21. Therefore, the remarks seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 26 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited in Claim 26 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 26 be removed.

Claim 28 depends from Claim 26 and is allowable due to its dependence from an allowable base claim. This claim is also allowable for its own recited features that, in combination with those recited in Claim 26, are neither disclosed nor suggested in references of record, either singly or in combination with one another.

Claim 29 recites a computer entity comprising a data processor, a data storage device, a printer port, and having an attached printer device, said computer entity comprising:

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

- a module for decrypting an encrypted document file;
- a unique device identifier for identifying said computer entity;
- wherein said computer entity operates to:
 - receive a document file in encrypted format;
 - decrypt said document;
 - extract a unique device identifier data from said document;
 - compare said extracted unique identifier data with said unique device identifier of said computer entity;
 - if a match is found between said received unique device identifier data of said document and said unique identifier of said computer entity, send a said document file for printing by said attached printer device; and
 - after sending said document to said printer device, delete said document file from said computer entity;
- adding a permitted quantity data to said document file, said permitted quantity data specifying a permitted number of copies of said document file which can be printed; and
- receiving a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file.

Claim 29 recites sending "receiving a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file".

Accordingly, Claim 29 recites material similar to that originally seen in Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9, 10, 15, 18, 21 and 26. Therefore, the remarks seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 29 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited in Claim 29 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 29 be removed.

Claim 30 recites a method of secure printing of a received document file, said method comprising the steps of:

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

- receiving said document file in encrypted format;
- reading a unique device identifier data identifying a recipient device for which said document file is intended;
- comparing said unique device identifier data with a locally stored identifier data corresponding to a local computer entity device;
- if said locally stored identifier data differs from said unique device identifier data identifying said recipient device for which said document file is intended, deleting said document file without printing any physical copies of said document file;
- printing a number of physical copies of said document file, corresponding to a permitted quantity defined in said document file, wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within the document file and wherein said document file is automatically deleted; and
- sending a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file.

Claim 30 recites sending "sending a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file".

Accordingly, Claim 30 recites material similar to that originally seen in Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9, 10, 15, 18, 21, 26 and 29. Therefore, the remarks seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 30 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited in Claim 30 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 30 be removed.

Claim 31 recites a method of secure printing of a received document file, said method comprising the steps of:

- receiving said document file in encrypted format;
- reading a unique device identifier data identifying a recipient device for which said document file is intended;

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

- comparing said unique device identifier data with a locally stored device identifier data;
- reading a permitted quantity data describing a permitted quantity of copies from said document file;
- if said received unique device identifier data corresponds with said locally stored device identifier data, printing said permitted quantity of copies of said document file and automatically deleting said document file;
- printing a number of physical copies of said document file, corresponding to a permitted quantity defined in said document file; and
- **sending a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file.**

Claim 31 recites sending "sending a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file".

Accordingly, Claim 30 recites material similar to that originally seen in Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9, 10, 15, 18, 21, 26, 29 and 30. Therefore, the remarks seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 31 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited in Claim 31 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 31 be removed.

Claim 32 recites a printer device comprising:

- a data input device for receiving an encrypted digital document file;
- a decryption algorithm for decrypting said received document file;
- a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in said received document file, for **sending a confirmation message upon receipt of the document file** and automatically deleting said document file;

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

- a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document file,
- wherein said printer device locally stores a decryption key for operating said decryption algorithm to decrypt said received document file; and
- wherein said printer device is configured to send a confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file, wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within the document file.

Claim 32 recites sending "sending a confirmation message confirming receipt of said document file".

Accordingly, Claim 30 recites material similar to that originally seen in Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9, 10, 15, 18, 21, 26, 29, 30 and 31. Therefore, the remarks seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 32 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited in Claim 32 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 32 be removed.

Claim 33 recites a printer device comprising:

- a data input device for receiving a digital document file;
- a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in said received document file and for sending a confirmation message upon receipt of the document file; and
- a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document file,
- wherein said controller operates to compare a received unique identifier data contained in said received document file with a locally stored unique device identifier data stored at said printer

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

device and operates to control printing of a predetermined quantity of said physical copy, wherein said predetermined quantity is specified in said received document file;

- if said received unique identifier data matches said stored unique device identifier, control printing of at least one said physical copy of said document file and automatically delete said document file; and
- if said received unique identifier data contained the said received document file does not match said stored unique device identifier data, to inhibit printing of any physical copies of said document file.

Claim 33 recites sending "sending a confirmation message upon receipt of the document file".

Accordingly, Claim 30 recites material similar to that originally seen in Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9, 10, 15, 18, 21, 26, 29, 30, 31 and 32. Therefore, the remarks seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 33 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited in Claim 33 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 33 be removed.

Claim 35 recites a printer device comprising:

- a data input device for receiving an encrypted digital document file;
- a decryption algorithm for decrypting said received document files;
- a controller for controlling printing of an image of data contained in said received document file;
- a printer mechanism for printing a physical copy of said document file,
- wherein a decryption key is stored locally in said printer device for operating said decryption algorithm to decrypt said received document files;

S/N 10/056,117

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

- said controller operates to compare a received unique identifier data contained in said received document file with a locally stored unique device identifier data stored at said printer device;
- if said received unique identifier data matches said stored unique device identifier, control printing of at least one said physical copy of said document file and automatically deleting said document file; and
- if said received unique identifier data contained the said received document file does not match said stored unique device identifier data, to inhibit decryption of said document file and inhibit printing of any physical copies of said document file;
- wherein said printer device is configured to send a confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file, wherein the specified permitted number of copies of said document file is contained within said document file.

Independent Claim 35 is not currently amended.

Claim 35 recites sending "a confirmation message back to said sending computer entity, confirming receipt of said document file, and confirming printing of a specified permitted number of copies of said document file".

Accordingly, Claim 35 recites material similar to that originally seen in Claim 8, and currently seen in Claims 1, 9, 10, 15, 18, 21, 26, 29, 30, 31, 32 and 33. Therefore, the remarks seen above with respect to Claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that Claim 15 is allowable for at least the reasons Claim 1 is allowable.

Additionally, the Applicant notes that the last paragraph of Claim 35 does not appear to have been addressed in the rejection of Claim 35. Accordingly, the Applicant anticipates the same (or similar) rejection as applied to Claim 8, and incorporates by reference the remarks associated with Claim 1.

S/N 10/056,117

DEC 12 2006

Response to Office Action Mailed 09/11/2006

1 In view of these arguments, the Applicant submits that the elements recited
2 in Claim 35 are not taught or suggested by the prior art of record. Accordingly,
3 the Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claim 35, as
4 amended, be removed.

5 **Conclusion**

6 The Applicant submits that all of the claims are in condition for allowance
7 and respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If the Office's
8 next anticipated action is not the issuance of a Notice of Allowability, the
9 Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the
10 purpose of scheduling an interview.

11 The Applicant would greatly appreciate the opportunity to speak with the
12 Examiner on this application, if that would be convenient with the Examiner, in an
13 attempt to come to a resolution of this case.

14
15 Respectfully Submitted,

16
17 Dated: 12 Dec 2006

By: 

David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

LEE & HAYES PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979